

MONROE D. KIAR

TOWN ATTORNEY
TOWN OF DAVIE
6191 SW 45th Street, Suite 6151A
Davie, Florida 33314
(954) 584-9770

TOWN ATTORNEY REPORT

DATE: January 20, 2005

FROM: Monroe D. Kiar

RE: Litigation Update

1. **Sunrise Water Acquisition Negotiations:** On August 27, 2003 and August 28, 2003, Mr. Stanley Cohen met individually with each Councilmember as well as Town Staff and the Town Attorney relevant to exploring the feasibility of the Town acquiring the Sunrise Water System and the Ferncrest Facility. Some time back, The Town Attorney spoke with Ken Cohen during which Mr. Cohen advised the Town Attorney that the Town Staff had finalized its report regarding the acquisition of the Western Area Utilities as well as Ferncrest Utilities in the east and that Staff had distributed its report to the Councilmembers. Mr. Cohen indicated at that time that his Staff would be meeting with the Council seeking its direction as to what action the Town Council wished to take on this matter. On August 24, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Ken Cohen, who indicated that Staff had not yet met with the Council and that there had been no new changes in this matter since the prior Litigation Update Report. At the Town Council Meeting of September 7, 2004, the Mayor and Council requested that this item be placed on a future agenda for discussion purposes. On October 13, 2004, in Mr. Cohen's absence, the Town Attorney spoke with Daniel Colabella of the Utilities Department requesting an update as to the status of this matter. Mr. Colabella indicated that he had provided the Administration with updated utility pricing figures for water in Broward County for single family residences so that information could be incorporated into a future presentation by the Administration to the Town Council. On November 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Cohen who indicated that his office would be meeting individually with councilmembers to see if there were additional issues or concerns and thereafter, would schedule a Workshop in January, 2005. On December 17, 2004, the Town Attorney's Office spoke again with Mr. Cohen who indicated that there had been no change regarding this matter since the last Litigation Update Report. On January 20, 2005, the Town Attorney's Office spoke with Mr. Cohen who indicated that the individual meetings with the Councilmembers had not yet been scheduled and that there had been no change regarding this matter since the last Litigation Report.
2. **Christina MacKenzie Maranon v. Town of Davie:** The Town of Davie filed a Motion for Summary Final Judgment on behalf of the Town of Davie and Police Officer Quentin Taylor seeking to dismiss both parties as defendants in this lawsuit. In response, the Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint naming the Town of Davie only as a defendant. Officer Taylor was no longer named a party to these proceedings. The Town thereafter, filed a Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint, but after hearing the Motion to Dismiss, it was denied and the Plaintiff was given leave to file a new Amended Complaint in these proceedings. As previously reported, the Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint and our special legal counsel, Mr. McDuff, prepared and filed an appropriate answer with

the Court. On May 12, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff who advised the Town Attorney that the Plaintiff had filed a Notice requesting the Court to set this matter for trial. On January 20, 2005, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant in his absence, who indicated the status of this case remains the same and no trial date has yet been set. She indicated that Mr. McDuff had filed a Notice to set the matter for trial with the Court. Mr. McDuff assured the Town Attorney that once a trial date is scheduled by the Court, he will so advise the Town Attorney. In the meantime, Mr. McDuff remains confident that ultimately, this matter will be dismissed on the merits.

3. **Spur Road Property:** As indicated by Mr. Willi to the Town Council at its meeting of January 2, 2003, Mr. Burke advised Mr. Willi that the 4th District Court of Appeal had affirmed the decision of the Florida Department of Transportation to accept the bid of Kevin Carmichael, Trustee, for the sale and purchase of the property which forms the subject matter of the State Road 84 Spur property litigation. At the Town Council Meeting of February 5, 2003, Mr. Willi requested that the Town Council grant him authority to take whatever legal action was necessary to obtain the property in question. That authority was given to him by the Town Council. At the Town Council Meeting of November 5, 2003, the Town Council authorized Mr. Willi to retain the law firm of Becker & Poliakoff to institute an eminent domain proceeding relevant to this property. A Special Executive Session with the attorneys for Becker & Poliakoff and the Town Council was conducted on December 17, 2003. Thereafter, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Daniel Rosenbaum, our special legal counsel, who indicated that the attorneys in his office were finalizing with the retained professionals, the issues that have been addressed. On February 26, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Rosenbaum's colleague, who advised the Town Attorney that the survey the appraiser was relying upon for determining value that the Town needs to make for a determination of its good faith offer to the potential condemnee, if the Town decides to exercise its power of eminent domain, did not reflect all of the encumbrances upon the subject site. Thereafter, all of the documents pertaining to encumbrances, reservations, easements, etc., upon the site given to the attorneys by Attorneys' Title Insurance Company were forwarded to the surveyor to make sure the documents were properly reflected in the survey so the appraiser could properly appraise the property. On April 15, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Daniel Rosenbaum and as indicated above, Mr. Rosenbaum stated that there were two outstanding issues which were with the outside vendors that needed to be resolved before definitive action by the Town Council could be taken. One issue involved the need for additional information on a survey commenced by the Town, which had necessitated a several week delay. The surveyors indicated to Mr. Rosenbaum that they needed additional documentation and this was forwarded to them by his office. The other issue involved a meeting which was scheduled by Mr. Rosenbaum and his staff with the Town's Land Planner to conclude the available uses of the subject site. Mr. Rosenbaum indicated that after these two issues have been dealt with, he anticipated that his firm would be proceeding in such manner as to move this matter forward aggressively. On April 28, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Jeff Rembaum, Mr. Rosenbaum's colleague. Mr. Rembaum indicated that his office was still waiting on the Town's outside land use expert to opine as to the available use of the site. Additionally, he indicated they were awaiting the revised survey that the appraiser could rely upon in determining the value. On May 13, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Rosenbaum, who indicated that his office had made significant progress on the technical issues and that all experts were on track with regard to the proposed time table for initiating the legal action. On May 26, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with a representative for Mr. Rembaum's office, who indicated that according to her belief, the status of this matter remained the same. This was later reconfirmed by Mr. Rosenbaum personally in a telephone conversation with the Town Attorney on May 27, 2004. On June 10, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Rosenbaum, who indicated that the incompletions contained in the initial survey had been addressed and his current surveyor was completing the survey so that it may then be

transmitted in a workable form to the appraiser. He indicated once the appraisal had been obtained, his firm would be able to commence litigation. On June 29, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Attorney Jeff Rembaum, who advised that his office expected to receive the final report from the Town's land use expert within the next few days and once received, his appraiser could then finish his report. On July 26, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Rembaum, who indicated that his office had received the report from the land use expert as to the available uses which the appraiser needed in order to prepare its appraisal. Mr. Rembaum indicated on August 11, 2004, that Staff had recently redefined the area of potential taking to be in conformity with the Town's existing roadways. He indicated that this would require additional surveying work by his surveyor, and that his evaluation experts were currently working on their appraisal of the subject property. On August 24, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Attorney Jeff Rembaum as to the current status of the proposed eminent domain proceeding. Mr. Rembaum indicated once again that due to the fact that Staff had redefined the area of potential taking, that his surveyors were conducting additional surveying work which he expected to be completed shortly and this would allow his evaluation experts to complete their appraisal of the subject property. He again, indicated that it was his hope to be before the Town Council shortly with a presentation. On September 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Daniel Rosenbaum who advised the Town Attorney that the revised sketches for the proposed taking complete with drainage and related areas, was prepared on August 30, 2004, and the sketches were being reviewed by the Town Staff and experts for final consideration. On October 27, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with special legal counsel, Daniel Rosenbaum, who advised the Town Attorney that they anticipated making a presentation regarding this potential eminent domain proceeding in December, 2004. Subsequent to that telephone conversation, the Town Attorney spoke with Interim Town Administrator, Chris Kovanes, on November 22, 2004, who indicated that our special legal counsel has now decided to meet individually with the Town Councilmembers. On December 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Jeff Rembaum, one of our special legal counsels, who advised that his firm was ready to proceed with the litigation, but would be seeking direction as to how to proceed from the members of the Town Council. He indicated at that time that he would like to meet individually with each Councilmember and thereafter, will request that this item be placed on the Agenda for a Town Council Meeting so that his firm could receive official direction from the Town as to how to proceed. On January 20, 2005, the Town Attorney again spoke with Mr. Jeff Rembaum who indicated that he was waiting for the Town to get the URS access study updated to reflect the changes due to ottd and other factors, and that his firm needed this update before Council would be in a position to make an informed decision. He anticipated meeting with the individual Councilmembers in February.

4. **DePaola v. Town of Davie:** Plaintiff DePaola filed a lawsuit against the Town of Davie and the Town filed a Motion to Dismiss. The Motion to Dismiss was heard by Judge Burnstein who requested that both sides file Memoranda of Law in support of their positions and she took the case under advisement. Both sides did file their Memoranda of Law in support of their positions on the Town's Motion to Dismiss, and on November 13, 2002, the Court entered an Order granting the Town's Motion to Dismiss and entered an Order of Dismissal. The Court found that Mr. DePaola had administrative remedies as a career service employee, either by pursuing a civil service appeal or by a grievance procedure established under a collective bargaining agreement, but he had failed to pursue his administrative remedies. A copy the Court's Order of November 13, 2002, has been previously provided to the Town Council for its review. The Plaintiff DePaola filed a motion with the Court for re-hearing of the Town's Motion to Dismiss, which motion was denied by the Trial Court. The attorneys for DePaola filed a Notice of Appeal of the Trial Court's decision to the 4th District Court of Appeal where the matter is now pending, but failed to file their Appellate Brief within the time set by the Rules of Appellate Procedure. As indicated in prior Town Attorney

Litigation Update Reports, the Town's Motion to Dismiss was filed with the 4th District Court of Appeal due to the Plaintiff's failure to file in a timely manner, its Appellate Brief, but the Motion was denied and the 4th District Court of Appeal extended the time in which the Plaintiff could file his Brief. The Plaintiff thereafter, did file his Brief and Mr. Burke's office in turn, prepared and filed its Answer Brief on December 9, 2003. Thereafter, the Appellant, Mr. DePaola, filed his Reply Brief with the 4th District Court of Appeal of Florida, and a copy has been furnished to the Town Administrator, Mayor and Councilmembers for their information. Oral argument was conducted and presented to the 4th District Court of Appeal by both sides on February 10, 2004. On April 28, 2004, the Town Attorney received a copy of the 4th District Court of Appeal's decision from Michael T. Burke, special legal counsel. The 4th District Court of Appeal reversed the lower court's Final Judgment dismissing Mr. DePaola's Complaint finding that his Complaint stated a cause of action and remanded the case to the trial court for proceedings consistent with the Court of Appeal's opinion. On May 26, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke's legal assistant who indicated that Mr. Burke's office would be filing an answer and would be ultimately scheduling the Plaintiff for deposition and would be conducting discovery in the near future. On May 27, 2004, Mr. Burke telephoned the Town Attorney to tell him that the Court would be permitting the Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint. During the week of June 7, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke who indicated that the Plaintiff had filed an Amended Complaint and his office was preparing an appropriate response. He indicated that discovery in this matter would commence shortly. On June 25, 2004, the Town of Davie filed its Answer and Defenses to the Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. On September 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke who indicated that his office was continuing to conduct discovery in this matter. On September 28, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke who indicated that his office had received the Plaintiff's Answers to the Interrogatories served upon the Plaintiff as well as the documents his office had requested to be produced by the Plaintiff. On November 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke's legal assistant, who advised that this matter was in the discovery phase and his office was currently setting depositions. On January 19, 2005, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke who indicated that there had been no change in the status of this litigation since the last Town Attorney's Litigation Update Report.

5. **City of Cooper City v. Town of Davie:** The City of Cooper City has filed a lawsuit for Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief and Alternative Petitions for Writ of Quo Warranto and Certiorari alleging that a recent ordinance and a recent resolution relevant to annexation are invalid. The Town Attorney's Office prepared an appropriate Motion to Dismiss and filed same as the Town's insurance carrier has refused to provide a legal defense to this action. As the Town Council has previously been advised, this office filed its Motion to Dismiss citing Cooper City's failure to comply with pertinent provisions of the Florida Statutes. Included within those enumerated provisions cited by the Town Attorney's Office, was Cooper City's failure to adhere to the "Intergovernmental Conflict Dispute Resolution" provisions of the Florida Statutes set forth in Chapter 164. Oral argument on the Town's Motion to Dismiss was heard on March 26, 2003 at which time the Judge indicated that this was the first time a matter such as this has come before him in 19 years on the bench and accordingly, he advised both sides that he would take this matter under advisement and get back to the attorneys shortly with his decision. The Judge thereafter, ordered that Cooper City's lawsuit was to be abated until Cooper City had initiated and exhausted the provisions set forth in Chapter 164. The Town and Cooper City engaged in the conflict resolution proceedings and attempted to resolve the matter without resorting to further legal remedies. As indicated in previous Litigation Reports, the Town Attorney's Office is confident in an ultimate successful outcome of this litigation and it is the Town Attorney's position that the Judge's abatement of Cooper City's lawsuit is further proof of the Town's contention that Cooper City had prematurely and inaccurately filed the present lawsuit. The initial meeting required under the

“Intergovernmental Conflict Resolution” provisions of Florida Statutes Chapter 164 was held on April 17, 2003. The meeting was attended by the Town Administrator, Mr. Willi, the City Manager of Cooper City, Mr. Farrell, along with their attorneys. The meeting had been advertised and was open to the public. As a resolution to the conflict was not reached, accordingly, pursuant to Section 164.1055, a joint meeting of the municipalities was held in order to resolve the conflict. The Town Council met in good faith, with the Cooper City Commission on September 30, 2003. Thereafter, representatives from the City of Cooper City and from the Town of Davie attended a mediation on November 13, 2003, at 1:00 P.M. before Mediator Arthur Parkhurst. A resolution of the parties’ differences was not reached at mediation and accordingly, the Intergovernmental Conflict procedures failed to resolve this matter. As the Intergovernmental Conflict Resolution procedures were concluded, the Town Attorney’s Office again set down its Motion to dismiss the lawsuit and for an award of attorney’s fees and oral argument consisting of more than an hour was conducted on February 18, 2004, before the Court. The Town Attorney’s Office was pleased with the oral argument presented by his office and is confident in the outcome. The Judge took the matter under advisement and requested that the oral argument of the legal counsels be transcribed so that he could review the oral argument along with the various cases given to him by the Town Attorney and those that will be submitted by Cooper City in support of their respective positions. The oral argument presented by the Town Attorney as well as that of opposing counsel has since been transcribed pursuant to the Judge’s Order and a copy of same has been provided to the Administrator and members of the Town Council for their information. A copy of the transcribed oral argument was provided by the Town Attorney’s Office to the Court. On April 2, 2004, the Court ruled on the Town’s Motion to dismiss the 6 count Complaint filed by the City of Cooper City against the Town to invalidate Town of Davie Ordinance 2002-37 and Resolution R-2002-259. Cooper City had filed its Complaint against the Town requesting declaratory judgment and supplemental relief, petitions for a Writ of Quo Warranto and Certiorari. Upon review of the oral arguments brought by the Town Attorney’s Office in opposition to those petitions for relief, the Court dismissed 5 of the 6 counts filed by Cooper City in its Complaint against the Town. The Town Attorney had successfully argued that each of the Plaintiff’s counts for injunctive and declaratory relief were invalid as well as the Plaintiff’s Petition for Certiorari and the sole remaining count allowed by the Court was for a Writ of Quo Warranto. The Town Attorney’s Office will endeavor to have the final available count dismissed and will continue to keep the Town Council apprised of the status of this case. Shortly after the Town Attorney’s Office filed its Answer to the remaining count with the Court, it began the discovery phase of this litigation. The Town Attorney’s Office prepared and served upon Cooper City a Request for Production of Documents for the Town Attorney’s review. Two large boxes of documents were received by the Town Attorney’s Office in response to its Request for Production of Documents. Interrogatories propounded on the Plaintiff, Cooper City, were also prepared and served upon Cooper City and Cooper City’s response has now been received and reviewed. Cooper City in turn, filed a Request for Production of Documents from the Town of Davie which was forwarded to the Town Administrator’s Office for review. Those documents which are discoverable under the Rules of Civil Procedure have been produced by the various Staff members and on September 28, 2004, forwarded to the attorney for Cooper City. Cooper City also filed a series of Interrogatories addressed to the Town and these were also answered by the Town and the Town’s response served upon Cooper City on September 28, 2004. It should be noted that the Town Staff worked diligently to gather together the production requested by Cooper City and worked closely with the Town Attorney’s Office in order to respond to the Interrogatories served upon the Town. Both sides have indicated their intent to schedule depositions of various Staff members employed by the City of Cooper City and the Town of Davie and the first deposition was taken on November 10, 2004. That was the deposition of Mr. Les Spencer of the Broward County Engineering Division. In the meantime, the Town Attorney’s Office filed a Motion seeking a better response from the Plaintiff relevant to the Town’s Request for Production of Documents, and served a public records request

upon the City of Cooper City. The Town Attorney's Office filed a public records request seeking additional documents as it believed these should have been provided by Cooper City in response to the Town's Request for Production of Documents, but was not so provided. As indicated in prior Litigation Update Reports, a large package of documents from the City of Cooper was received in response to our public records request and these included documents which had not been previously provided pursuant to our Request for Production of Documents. These have been reviewed by the Town Attorney's Office. As indicated in the last Litigation Update Report, the Town received a response from Cooper City relevant to the Town's Motion and accordingly the Town Attorney's office prepared and filed an appropriate answer to Cooper City's pleading.

6. **MIGUEL LEAL V. OFFICER WILLIAM BAMFORD, ET AL:** The Plaintiff is suing 14 named police officers from various municipalities, including Lt. William H. Bamford, and K-9 Officer Banjire. It is his contention that in the course of his arrest, the officers used unnecessary force and therefore, violated his rights under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. He is seeking compensatory damages of \$20,000,000.00 and punitive damages of \$20,000,000.00. As previously reported to the Town Council, the Town has filed an appropriate response to the Plaintiff's Complaint and the Plaintiff has been deposed and the Town is moving forward. On October 29, 2003, our special legal counsel, Mr. McDuff, filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in this matter with regard to several of the Defendants named in the lawsuit. On July 27, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff, who confirmed that the Court had granted a partial Final Judgment in favor of certain defendants named by Mr. Leal in his lawsuit. The Court granted the Motion for Summary Judgment with regard to Town of Davie Police Officers Anton, Bamford, and Kilpatrick. The Motion was denied as to Defendant, Squarini without prejudice to later renewing that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss. On August 25, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff who indicated that the Plaintiff had added several new defendants to the lawsuit and he had filed a Motion for Summary Judgment regarding those individuals. On September 28, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant, who advised that a trial date had been set by the Court in this case for the week commencing May 10, 2005. Mr. McDuff continues to remain confident that the Town will ultimately prevail in this litigation. On December 20, 2004, the Town Attorney again spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant, who indicated that their office is awaiting the Court's decision on the Motion for Summary Judgment on behalf of Lt. Squarini. On December 21, 2004, Mr. McDuff advised the Town Attorney that although trial was scheduled for the week of May 10, 2005, the Court had recently entered an Order vacating its Orders relating to any trial or pre-trial scheduling. Finally, on January 20, 2005, the Town Attorney again spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant who indicated that there had been no change in the status of this litigation since the last Litigation Update Report.
7. **SESSA, ET AL V. TOWN OF DAVIE (TOWN OF DAVIE V. MALT):** As indicated in previous reports, the Town Attorney's Office successfully recovered various sums from a number of property owners relevant to the special road assessment as a result of filing several lawsuits to enforce the road assessment liens recorded against their properties. The various settlement proposals have been outlined in previous Town Attorney's Litigation Update Reports, and have each been brought before the Town Council for its consideration and ultimate approval. As each property owner has transmitted the funds to the Town, the Town Attorney's Office has filed appropriate pleadings releasing the Lis Pendens and dismissing the cases filed against these Defendants. The Town Attorney's Office continues in its efforts to recover the money owed the Town from the special road assessments. The Town Attorney's Office had filed a lawsuit against property owner, Robert Malt, to foreclose its lien on Mr. Malt's property. The Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss, but the Court at a hearing on August 10, 2004, denied the Motion to Dismiss and ordered the Defendant to file an answer to the Complaint filed by the Town Attorneys' Office. The Town Attorney's Office received

Mr. Malt's Answer and Affirmative Defenses to the Town's Complaint and Counterclaim and the Town Attorney's Office filed a Motion to Strike the Defendant's Affirmative Defenses, a Motion to Dismiss the Defendant's Counterclaim and a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. At the Town Council's Meeting of October 6, 2004, the Town Council was advised that a mediation had been scheduled for October 14, 2004, and the Town Council gave the Town Attorney authority to enter into meaningful settlement negotiations with the Defendant subject to the ultimate review and approval by the Town Council. No settlement was reached at the mediation session and the parties reached an impasse. Accordingly, the hearing on the Town's Motion to Strike the Defendant's Affirmative Defenses, Motion to Dismiss the Defendant's Counterclaim, and a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings was heard by the Court on October 19, 2004. After oral argument by both sides, the Court granted the Town's Motion to Strike the Defendant's Affirmative Defenses, granted the Town's Motion to Dismiss his Counterclaim and granted the Town's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. A proposed Order was submitted by the Town Attorney's Office to the Court for its review and was signed by the Court on November 1, 2004. A copy of the Order signed by Judge Fleet has been forwarded to the Town Council for its review. Thereafter, the Defendant filed a Motion for Rehearing relevant to the Court's decision and the Town Attorney's Office filed a response in opposition to the Defendant's Motion for Rehearing. The Court ultimately denied the Defendant's Motion for Rehearing. The Town Attorney's Office will continue to move forward with this special assessment foreclosure action.

8. **TOWN OF DAVIE V. LAMAR ELECTRONICS, INC.:** The Town successfully prosecuted Lamar Electronics, Inc. for several violations of the Town Code before the Special Master. Lamar Electronics has filed an Appeal with the Circuit Court of Broward County. Lamar Electronics filed its Initial Brief and in response, the Town Attorney's Office on behalf of the Town, has filed an Answer Brief. Lamar Electronics in response, filed a Reply Brief. The Town filed a Motion to Strike the Reply Brief of the property owner and after hearing, the Court allowed the Reply Brief to stand, but however, with the caveat that Lamar Electronics will not be able to utilize their argument with regard to the Right to Farm Act. The Court now has before it the various Briefs filed by the parties and the Town Attorney's Office is awaiting the Court's ruling with regard to the Defendant's appeal. As of the date of this Litigation Update Report, December 8, 2004, there has not yet been a ruling by the Court. In the meantime, the Court entered an Order Setting Case Management and requiring the parties to appear before the Court in this matter on November 5, 2004, at which time the Town Attorney's Office appeared and advised the Court of the status of this matter. The Judge ordered that there be oral argument in this case for January 27, 2005, before it would enter a decision in this matter. There has been no change in the status of this litigation since the last Litigation Update Report of January 5, 2005.
9. **FRANCIS McDONOUGH V. TOWN OF DAVIE:** Plaintiff, Francis McDonough, has filed a Complaint/Petition for Writ of Certiorari in which he is allegedly appealing the conditions imposed by the Town Council of the Town of Davie on Plaintiff's Application for a Plat Plan Approval. The Town Attorney's Office filed a Motion to Dismiss on the grounds that the Plaintiff had failed to attach the transcript of the Quasi Judicial Hearing as required by the Rules of Appellate Procedure. The Court denied the Motion to Dismiss and accordingly, the Town Attorney's Office has prepared and filed an Answer to the Complaint/Petition for Writ of Certiorari on behalf of the Town of Davie as well as a Brief in Support of its Answer. The Answer and supporting Brief were filed with the Court on September 13, 2004. The Court originally scheduled oral argument in this matter for December 17, 2004, and it was anticipated that the Court would thereafter make a decision based upon both the Briefs filed by the parties and their oral presentation in Court. In the meantime, the Plaintiff, Mr. McDonough, through his attorney, made a settlement proposal, a copy of which was forwarded to the Interim Town Administrator, Mayor and Councilmembers for their review. A

Special Executive Session was held on December 1, 2004, at which time direction was obtained from the Town Council. The attorney for Mr. McDonough was thereafter contacted and an amended proposal setting forth the direction of the Town Council submitted to Mr. McDonough's attorney. Thereafter telephone negotiations ensued and ultimately Mr. McDonough's attorney after first rejecting the Town Council's amended proposal thereafter submitted Mr. McDonough's amended proposal which appears to comply with the direction given by the Town Council. A copy of Mr. McDonough's latest settlement proposal has been forwarded to the Town Administrator, Mayor and Councilmembers for their review. This latest settlement proposal will be brought before the Town Council in the near future for its consideration.

10. **PARK CITY MANAGEMENT CORP. AND PARK CITY ESTATES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION V. TOWN OF DAVIE:** The Town has been served with a Complaint for Declaratory Relief relevant to the issue of the maintenance of the 18th Street median strip within the Park City Mobile Home Park. The Town Attorney's Office prepared a Motion to Dismiss and at the hearing, the Court held that the Complaint was brought in a procedurally correct manner and the Court will be hearing the merits of the case. In the meantime, members of the Homeowners Association have expressed their desire to withdraw as a party plaintiff in this litigation. The Plaintiff's attorney in turn, filed a Motion to Amend its Complaint to drop the Homeowners Association as a Plaintiff and to name it along with the Town of Davie as a Defendant. The Judge allowed the Plaintiff to file its Amended Complaint which names Park City Homeowners' Association as a defendant in the lawsuit. It should be noted that the jurisdictional limitations on Count II for Specific Performance of an alleged oral contract allegedly entered into between the Town of Davie and Park City Management is capped for jurisdictional purposes at the total amount of \$15,000.00 since the County Court does not have jurisdiction beyond that amount. Opposing counsel stipulated to that fact. The Town Attorney's Office prepared an Answer which it filed in response to the Complaint and has begun conducting discovery. The Town Attorney's Office recently sent out its First Request for Admissions demanding that the Plaintiff admit the correctness of the allegations set forth within that pleading. A series of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents was also served upon the Plaintiff by the Town Attorney's Office. A response to the Request for Admissions and Answers to the Interrogatories have been received. In the meantime, Co-Defendant, Park City Estates Homeowners Association has hired an attorney to represent its interest and filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint as to that Defendant. Recently, a hearing was held on the Homeowners' Motion to Dismiss which after oral argument, the Court denied. The Town Attorney's Office has recently initiated scheduling depositions in this case. The first deposition of management personnel was conducted last week by the Town Attorney's office and additional depositions will be scheduled shortly.
11. **FEINGOLD V. TOWN OF DAVIE:** The Town Attorney has been advised by Mr. McDuff's office that a Complaint was filed against the Town of Davie alleging that the Plaintiff, while riding his horse, had been thrown from the horse by electrical wiring and is claiming bodily injury and has sued the Town and FPL. On August 10, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant, who indicated that his office had filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint as it pertains to the Town of Davie and said Motion is still pending. On September 8, 2004, the Town Attorney again discussed this litigation with Mr. McDuff, who indicated that several depositions have been taken of various witnesses and that Mr. Feingold's deposition would be taken shortly. On September 28, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant in his absence, who indicated that due to the recent hurricanes, a number of the depositions that had been scheduled had been canceled and rescheduled. On November 8, 2004, the Town Attorney again spoke with Mr. McDuff, who advised that his office had taken the deposition of the Plaintiff, Mr. Feingold, and that his office was currently scheduling other depositions to be taken. He reiterated the fact that no

trial date in this matter has yet been set. On December 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant, who indicated that they have recently received some of the medical records requested by Mr. McDuff's office and they are awaiting production of further documents. On January 20, 2005 the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. McDuff's legal assistant who indicated that recently the Plaintiff offered to settle this matter for \$49,999.99. In turn, Mr. McDuff's firm submitted an offer to settle the matter for the sum of \$1001.00.

12. **LAKEWOOD TRAVEL PARK V. TOWN OF DAVIE AND JOLMY:** On July 26, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke, who indicated that the Plaintiff had instituted a lawsuit contesting the Town's approval of the subject site plan. Mr. Burke's office filed a Brief on behalf of the Town in response to the Complaint filed by the Plaintiff. On September 8, 2004, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke who advised the Town Attorney's Office that the matter had been fully briefed. Thereafter, Judge Andrews entered an Order in favor of the Town and denying Lakewood Travel Park, Inc.'s Petition for Writ of Certiorari. On or about December 6, 2004, Mr. Burke's office advised the Town Attorney that Lakewood Travel Park had filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the 4th District Court of Appeal requesting that the 4th District Court of Appeal issue a Writ of Certiorari and quash the Town of Davie's approval, with conditions, regarding the Jolmy Truck Travel Center Site Plan. On January 6, 2005, Mr. Burke advised the Town Attorney that the 4th District Court of Appeal has now issued an Order to Show Cause requiring a response from the Town of Davie and Jolmy. Mr. Burke has indicated that his office is in the process of preparing an appropriate response to be filed with the Court. On January 19, 2005, the Town Attorney spoke with Mr. Burke who indicated that he had received an extension of time in which to file his response on behalf of the Town of Davie and that his office was in the process of preparing an appropriate response to be filed with the Court.
13. **TOWN OF DAVIE V. CARMAX SUPERSTORES:** The Special Master ruled in favor of the Town on the trial level and the Respondent, Carmax, appealed the ruling to the Circuit Court of Broward County and filed an Initial Brief. The Town Attorney's Office in response, filed an Answer Brief to the Initial Brief and the Respondent thereafter, filed a Reply Brief. The case has now been fully briefed and the Town Attorney's Office continues to await either a decision from the Court based upon the Briefs, or an Order requiring oral argument. In the meantime, a settlement proposal was received from the attorney for the Defendant which has been forwarded to the Code Enforcement Director, Daniel Stallone, for review.
14. **TOWN OF DAVIE V. OSVALDO CIEDI:** The Town filed a six count Code Enforcement action against the property owner alleging that he and others had violated the Davie Town Code and Charter. Specifically, the property owner was charged with violating Section 12 of the Town Charter, entitled, Franchise; Section 12-32 of the Town Code entitled Non-Permitted Use; Section 9-3 entitled Deposit of Waste Material on Private Property Prohibited; Section 12-328(B) entitled Engineering Permits; Section 12-33(U) entitled Nuisance; and Section 9-22 entitled garbage service required. After a several hour Hearing the Special Magistrate found the property owner in violation of the provisions of the Town Code and Charter mentioned above. The property owner was required to come into compliance with the Town Code and Charter.

* * * * *

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

* * * * *